

# DISCONTENT

"MOTHER OF PROGRESS"

Entered at the Postoffice at Lakebay, Wash., as Second Class Matter.

VOL. II. NO. 10.

LAKEBAY, WASH., WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 9, 1899.

WHOLE NO. 62.

## HE NEVER LENDS A HAND.

Across the surging waters  
We hear the cannon's roar;  
We know the dead and dying  
Are numbered by the score.  
Our soldier boys are fighting  
Upon a far-off strand;  
If God can save the noble,  
Why don't he lend a hand?

From out the gloomy city  
Come dirges for the dead;  
Strong men bow down in sorrow  
And children cry for bread.  
The deep and deadening anguish  
Cries out o'er every land:  
If God can save the innocent,  
Why don't he lend a hand?

We've heard the church bells ringing;  
We've heard the preacher pray;  
We've heard of Christian charity—  
The beggar spurned away.  
We've heard of special providence,  
But fail to understand,  
In famine, war, and pestilence,  
Why he don't lend a hand.

We've seen the sailor daring  
The storm's o'erwhelming wave;  
We've seen the laddies face the fire  
Their brother man to save.  
Yes, in the dark and trying hour,  
The creature man is grand;  
No succor ever came from God—  
He never lends a hand.

—Paul McComb, in Truth Seeker.

## "TIRED OF THE SUBJECT."

I assure Comrade Schellhaus that I am not tired enough to decline battle, if the editor (a title originally applied to the superintendent of combats in the Roman arena), and the rest of the spectators, can stand it. It was as an old newspaper man, myself, that I was for showing a little mercy to them. I take out of Comrade Schellhaus' last the points which seem to me worth meeting. (1) Man being a mass of bioplasm, and bioplasm a compound of oxygen, etc., which are minerals (true) then "man is a mass of mineral compounds." Well. What is Comrade Schellhaus going to do about it? The vegetable and animal bodies, which last includes the human, are derived from the mineral "kingdom." What then? (2) "Is instinct a chemical compound?" No. But the automatic motions, which objectively correspond to instincts, are due to chemical reactions. The same answer applies to desire, about which Comrade Schellhaus asks the same question. (3) I am very glad I have brought Comrade Schellhaus around to admitting that the egoistic theory has no basis in "mechanical philosophy," but only in metaphysics. That is just what I have been saying for a long time, but never got anyone to take notice of before. Egoism and Materialism, which generally go together, are, in very truth, metaphysical speculations, distinguished from others of the same sort by nothing but being the most superficial and silly. I assure Comrade Schellhaus that their metaphysical character, if its reality can be insinuated into the brains of Egoists and Materialists, will by no means recommend them in that quarter. I should not suppose there was any necessity for explaining what "mechanical

philosophy" is. Comrade Schellhaus evidently knows. But since he is dissatisfied with it, and challenges me on the ground of metaphysics, all right. Only, let us take note of his admission that, on that of mechanical philosophy, EGOISM CANNOT STAND (4) Now, I am pledged not to "stick to mechanical philosophy (whatever that may be) or ignore metaphysics, that is BEYOND THE ACTION OF MATTER, SO TO SPEAK." (I must emphasize these words for the edification of S. D. and my other materialistic friends who profess Egoism) I think, says Comrade Schellhaus, very correctly, that we must interpret the subjective by the objective. But, he complains, I do not explain "why we must initiate the process by subjective action." Well, in my opinion, because the subjective is all. We know matter, or the objective, only as an assemblage of phenomena, all of which are, in the last analysis, subjective states. That they can have sprung from the objective is simply inconceivable; but that the objective, or "matter (so to speak)" may spring from them, is conceivable. Hence the only rational view of things in general points, as I think and always thought, to a spiritual first cause (a God), and spiritual life everlasting (the immortality of the soul). But this is only my opinion about metaphysics, which excites the boundless scorn of materialistic Egoists, like S. D. Knowing it to be only that, I do not offer it for positive science. Why not? Because the function of positive science is to teach us how we may effect some objective result. It begins with phenomena. It ends by resolving phenomena into relations of quantity, which is the fundamental objective category. The function of metaphysics is widely different. Metaphysics is, as its very name imports, not the beginning of positive, or natural, science, but the end. After we have resolved phenomena into relations of quantity (the last result of science) metaphysics inquires "What is quantity?" and answers, in the persons of our greatest mathematicians, "Quantity is subjective; it is THAT OPERATION IN WHICH BOTH OPERATOR AND OPERAND DERIVE ALL THEIR SIGNIFICANCE FROM ITS OWN LAWS." But this is far beyond the comprehension of S. D. and other materialistic metaphysicians; everyone of whom is an Egoist. I do not expect them to call it anything but gibberish and "tall talk." I am addressing myself at present only to Comrade Schellhaus. It seems, then, that there are good metaphysics and bad metaphysics. Let us consider their affinities and their differences. Good metaphysics consist in truisms. They resolve themselves into this "Whatever is, is." Bad metaphysics consist in fallacies—"Something—e. g., matter, is—everywhere—therefore something else—spirit, e. g., is not." Both are propositions concerning everything in general, which means nothing in particular. Neither can be applied

to the purpose of effecting any objective result, which is the function of positive, or natural, science. Their only use is subjective—rhetorical or poetical. It is simply to excite emotion. My objection to Egoism hitherto has been that it is metaphysical, and does not, like the positive psychology, lead to any objective results. But since Comrade Schellhaus defends it on metaphysical grounds I will add that it is bad metaphysics, because ambiguous. If it means that everyone who can does AS HE PLEASES, it is true, and a truism, like all true metaphysics. You might as well say he does what he does. If it means that he SEEKS PLEASURE in any more special sense, even so general an one as this, that he does what he calculates is for his greatest pleasure—then it is false, and easily proven false. (5) Comrade Schellhaus says that when a voluntary action becomes automatic through habit (as the drinking of a dipsomaniac, I suppose,) "the volition is transferred from the act to the intent." I don't quite understand. Does he mean that the dipsomaniac wills intending to drink, though he need not will to take each particular glass? I think differently. The dipsomaniac often wills not intending to drink, but takes his glass at the usual hour, allee samee. Does he mean that the dipsomaniac wills not intending to drink, but does drink? That is true, and it proves my theory. (6) All actions are automatic to a great extent, then what, asks Comrade Schellhaus, about those which are not automatic to a very great extent? Why, so far as they are not automatic, they are voluntary and calculated. This is the slender basis of induction on which Egoism, like other metaphysical fallacies, reposes. But this last leg is knocked from under it by the admission that all actions are automatic in a great measure. (7) As to the assertion that self-tormentors (always) are actuated by hope of a heavenly reward, Comrade Schellhaus is simply mistaken. If he will read Krafft-Ebing's Psychopathia Sexualis, a book now in half of the physicians' offices, he will learn that the self-torturing instinct is merely a perverse form of the sexual. The expectation of any future reward is not its cause, but grows out of it, as all superstitions grow out of the instincts which prompt the conduct corresponding to them. Comrade Schellhaus says the obstinate slave's desire to escape flogging is "dominated by a stronger desire—not to submit." I repeat that is a reductio ad absurdum. Comrade Schellhaus undoubtedly knows what I mean. A reductio ad absurdum is a proposition which refutes itself—one which any good reasoner will be satisfied with having brought an opponent down to, instead of trying to refute it. No one who is not himself the slave of a theory would say that. The nigger in the case would not say it. He would say there was a physical impossibility—a material obstacle—in the way of his submitting. He wasn't built that way and can't do it, just as some one else cannot let liquor alone though he wants to. C. L. JAMES.

## THEOLOGICAL JUSTICE.

Two souls—a matron and a young woman—just released from earthly bondage, knocked at the gate of St. Peter's court. It was nearing the close of a very busy day's session, and the heavenly docket was fast being cleared when these two rapped for admittance and waited their turn for a final judgment. One, though care worn and somewhat gray, was the picture of hope and expectation; while the other, younger and fairer, wore a countenance devoid of hope, and was the counterpart of despair. No sooner had the heavy gate swung back upon its hinges when they were ushered into the presence of the great judge, and the following dialogue took place:

St. Peter: Stand forth woman! Hold up thy right hand. (Woman obeys.) What is thy name?

Woman: Mary Jones.

St. Peter: What country?

Woman: United States.

St. Peter: Give an account of your stewardship.

Woman: Well, I've been a good woman; done the best I could; worked hard, attended church, and always prayed twice a day.

St. Peter: Do you believe in the Bible?

Woman: Yes.

St. Peter: Everything in it?

Woman: EVERYTHING, from Genesis to Revelation.

St. Peter: What about the seventh commandment; have you kept that?

Woman: Yes, judge, never broke that commandment. That's more than this good-for-nothing hussy can say (pointing to the other woman).

St. Peter: Never mind her; one at a time is my rule. Are you married?

Woman: Yes; been married 18 years?

St. Peter: Any children? (Opening book of life.)

Woman: Yes; 15.

St. Peter: What's your age?

Woman: Forty-two, your honor.

Judge (serenely): Enough! To hell with her. (Turning to Lazarus) Take her out of my sight.

St. Peter: Next! Girl approaches. Hold up thy hand! Name?

Girl: Jessie Jones.

St. Peter: Country?

Girl: United States.

St. Peter: What hast thou to say for thyself?

Girl (hesitatingly): Very little.

St. Peter: Dost thou believe in the Bible?

Girl: Much of it I believe; but I fear I cannot conscientiously subscribe to all that is in it.

St. Peter (frowning): Dost thou doubt that ark story?

Girl: I—I—I do.

St. Peter: And that whale episode?

Girl: Yes, I have my doubts about that also.

(Continued on page 3.)



# DISCONTENT

"MOTHER OF PROGRESS".

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT LAKEBAY, WASH.

50 CENTS A YEAR

Address all communications to DISCONTENT,  
Lakebay, Wash.

Make all money orders payable on TACOMA,  
Wash.

## THE BALLOT IN COLORADO.

Colorado, it is well known, reached the goal of the equal suffragists' movement some time since. It came panting up to the line long enough ago for the thinkers to determine how much that has been hoped for on the one hand, and feared on the other, has been fulfilled. Women actually vote here, attend primaries, make up "slates," pull wires and are pulled by them, wield "influence," and are, in every political way, man's equal. The polls on election day look immensely like any other place where men and women are wont to gather. Women stand in groups talking over the situation, men and women mingle in a business-like way, and women alternate with men in the voting stalls, preparing their ballots, and acting as judges of election, clerks, watchers, deputy sheriffs, etc. They drive up in carriages, and step airily out, trim and tailor made, to brush against the shabby shawl of a sister politician. They breathe the same air. Aristocrat and plebian, respectable and outcast, go through the same performance, and alike regard it as immensely important. All this, and the heavens do not fall. The babies are still nursed in Colorado, buttons are still sewn on, dinners are cooked and husbands' whims are considered. Women are not more corrupted meeting their husbands, fathers, brothers and sons at the polls than meeting them elsewhere; families are not "broken up" more often than in other states; and women are no more "mannish" with a piece of paper in their hands which they are privileged to deposit in a ballot box than when holding a darning needle. Somebody has gotten up a comical play in which all the petty calamities of equal suffrage befall the characters; where the pretty wife of a millionaire becomes his political rival; where her failure to sew on a button properly and to prepare the dinner is laid to her political ambitions. But this doesn't count. In Colorado the extra counting of votes is accepted as a matter of course, and socially there is no appreciable difference between the old time and the new.

But have the claims of the earnest advocates of equal suffrage been in any degree realized?

What marvelous things have been hoped for and promised when women should share in the law-making departments of their country! Crime and poverty should cease, intemperance be abolished, equality before the law should be established, politics itself should become purified. Man-made government was the one source of all social evils, and with its disappearance the evils would vanish. Alas for the hopes of these sincere, old-world reformers! There are no startling changes for the better in the equal suffrage states. There is probably more political corruption in Denver than in any other city of its size in the United States. The originality of schemers, the frank boldness with

which "deals" are made, are positively admirable; there is genius in their conception. The number of "reform parties" which blossom out in brand-new offices, shining desks, and easy committee rooms, is astonishing. The ease with which they exist, or the causelessness of their sudden disappearances, is startling to the innocent outsider. New offices are strangely created and filled by the most impossible people. The hard-worked legislature passes more bills than any lawyer can keep track of, and nobody knows their effect—only that taxes are higher each year and the law-making machinery more and more expensive. We pay dearly for our legislation, but we get plenty of it. We scarcely know how it is done, but we find the law poking its finger into our drinking glass, our medicine cup, our nursery, our kitchen, our reading room, and, of course, our business generally. And still we clamor for more laws to regulate this or that evil, never stopping to think that the evils of which we complain are the results of laws that have been passed, and could be remedied more quickly by wiping the slate clean than by any other process. We have equal suffrage—and the invasions of individual liberty are proportionately greater. The equal suffragists have yet to learn that a weapon of invasion cannot become an instrument of liberty merely by being doubled up.—Lizzie M. Holmes, in Liberty.

## RIGHT IS MIGHT.

In DISCONTENT of July 12 "O. B. Server in his article, "Might Makes Right," states a fact none can dispute, viz., that "in the name of religion and government are committed crimes of every degree, regarded as virtues to be paraded under the cloaks of piety and patriotism." And this, he says, is all because these two forces are to the masses the representatives of power, "which is another name for 'might makes right.'"

But is it either just or right to make God or Christianity responsible for the conduct of people who adopt their names, but do not follow their instructions? It is a fashion of unjust critics to condemn a system which is judged by the people who do not represent it. True judgment is based on the evident virtue of a system as comprehended by the intellect of man, and the truest representatives of it are those who most nearly illustrate it.

Scorn of individuals, or bodies of individuals, is followed by prejudice against whatever system they profess to illustrate, and by this method every system under the sun can be condemned. Every system teaches more or less of the laws of God, and human mind has not yet conceived anything higher or nobler for the development of man. What we need, then, is a respect for all systems, a sight clear enough to see that all have some truth, and most of them much truth. Whatever of scorn or condemnation the professed followers of any system may merit does not change the truths contained in it; go to the truth for truth, not to man.

How is there to be freedom of thought so long as each individual or body of individuals are persuaded they have all the truth, and nothing can be right but the system they have adopted. The freethinker laughs at the church man because of his bigotry and prejudice, yet the freethinker on every hand is telling

us exactly what the church man has been telling us for ages: "Your way is all wrong; my way is right, and the only right way." No matter by what name we are called, if we are bigoted and prejudiced we shall seek only such things as confirm our prejudices and preconceived opinions. If we seek truth we shall find it, but so long as we seek only to confirm what we believe, and wish to persuade every one else to believe, we shall wander in delusions, arriving at truth by slow and laborious processes.

Right is the only might there is in the world. So far as we are right we are in power; so far as we are in error we are weak. Error is but a seeming power, as is well illustrated in the world, for, though error and ignorance predominate largely, the world and man are kept from destruction and depravity by the power of such truth as is permitted by man to express itself in the world. One spark of truth is mightier than a mountain of evil; this we realize when we look at the cities reeking with wickedness and vileness, yet such truth as dwells there makes society possible and develops man.

Right is the only might, for right is truth, and truth is the visible expression of love which is the soul of all things. When truth is separated from love in the minds of men they fall into all manner of delusions, for love is the guide, the way, and truth the becoming visible to men. It is because of this that so many fail when attempting to administer justice without love to guide them. We cannot know what is just except by the light of love. Justice alone creates a diversity of minds; what is just to one is unjust to another, but love unites all men.

It is not "the God idea" that needs to be gotten rid of in this world, but the man idea that is substituted for it and called by God's name. It is the failure to carry out the God idea that makes the trouble in this world. The nearest approach to a heavenly condition in this world is made by those who most perfectly live the God idea, whatever name they call themselves by, in the church or out of it. Let us choose such forms of truth as we feel best suited to us and leave others to do the same; the forms of truth are innumerable, and when free each will select such as is best suited to his state of development. The state of the world at any time is not because of this or that system of belief, but because of the condition of the people; such forms of truth as they have are all that they are capable of accepting. Truth is always knocking at the door, and just so much will come to man as he is able to receive. A state of heathenism or unjust belief will exist no longer than is necessary to the man; as soon as he is capable of the next higher step it opens before him. "The light shineth in the darkness, but the darkness comprehendeth it not, until such time as it seeks the light."

The "chains forged by our ancestors will fade and fall away" when we leave each other in the same freedom of thought as we desire for ourselves. It cannot come by way of the bigots who tell us their way is the only way, whether scientists, freethinkers or church men, but by each soul showing forth the light that is revealed to him.

MABEL GIFFORD.

## "LET THE TRUTH BE KNOWN."

Mr. W. H. Van Ornum, of Chicago, has been for many years a zealous advocate of Communism, and for a man who cannot think he certainly puts up a good battle for his religion. As I read his splendid advice to Mr. Chase to "think, Mr. Chase, think," I said to myself "what a pity Mr. Van Ornum does not follow the admonitions he so readily and gratuitously offers to others." If he did he would save the economic truth seekers a whole lot of confusion."

I am glad Mr. Van Ornum has given me an opportunity to show the readers of DISCONTENT that he does not follow his own advice, and is, therefore, doing a great injury to the cause of human emancipation, although nobody would question the honesty of his intentions. He is constantly confusing the doctrines of Anarchism and Communism, to the disadvantage of the student, and, like the drunken man who imagines everybody is drunk but himself, he has deluded himself into believing that he not only understands Anarchism better than Michael Bakounin, P. J. Proudhon, Josiah Warren, S. P. Andrews, B. R. Tucker, Spencer, Auberon Herbert and others, but that the anarchistic doctrines of these men are spurious! This, of course, could be treated as a joke were it not for the fact that, in the absence of clear ideas on social problems, life is turned from what ought to be a happy comedy into a painful tragedy. Of what value are the writings of a man who knows so little of Anarchism and its teachers as to class Michael Bakounin with Kropotkin and Reclus as a champion of common property? Bakounin, the most uncompromising individualist that ever lived! Every well-informed student knows there is as much difference in the social theories of Bakounin and Kropotkin as between those of Tucker and Van Ornum, and if Mr. Van Ornum desires to post himself a little he can secure Bakounin's principal works from Tucker, his translator. Bakounin never fell into that "lamentable error," as Proudhon calls it, of imagining Communism to be the only alternative for the present society. While Mr. Van Ornum tells his readers there is no such thing as individual freedom, Bakounin tells us that that is the only kind of freedom there is. Bakounin was a profound student of nature, and he accepted, what Kropotkin refuses to accept, the doctrine that life is a struggle. "Life is a struggle," says Proudhon. "Very good," says Bakounin; "let us abolish the state so that no man can escape that struggle. Let kings and queens be brought into competition with plebians, and let the struggle be uniform. As all work is a species of slavery, let slavery be equal as well as liberty." These were not Bakounin's words, but they correctly represent his thought. It is true Bakounin did not go so deeply into economic science as Proudhon; nevertheless he could see, as clearly as Proudhon, that competition—the thing which, strangely enough, both plutocratic robbers and Communists abhor—was the working man's only salvation; that the laborer had nothing to fear from the free operation of natural law, as he was the only "survivor" in the "struggle for existence," etc. He was, therefore, willing to trust all to liberty without any



appeal to sentiment. So much for Michael Bakounin.

More evidence of ignorance of the subject of which he professes to be the only teacher is found in Mr. Van Ornum's statement that I betray Anarchism by appealing to "authority" in referring to Proudhon. How the superficial mind loves to play upon words. "Authority! We must not appeal to ANY authority," says Mr. Van Ornum. If he and I should disagree as to the spelling or meaning of a word I must not appeal to the "authority" of the dictionary! The anarchistic builder must not appeal to his plumb line, nor the navigator to his compass, because they are "authorities" in their respective spheres! If Mr. Van Ornum was a reasoner, instead of a sentimentalist, he would soon see that Anarchism meant the establishment of NATURAL AUTHORITY and the destruction of artificial or man-made authority. In a free world, where everyone can exercise his talents in free competition with all others, the individual who excels in his field of endeavor is the "authority" whom all others must "obey." That is to say, he fixes the standard of excellence, to which all others must approach. If Brown makes the best cheese at labor cost, all others must imitate him if they expect to "survive" as cheese makers. Men cannot be dishonest if they have to "obey" natural authority. Jim Jeffries is the "authority" on pugilism; everyone admits it. If Steve Brodie can jump bridges, when all others fail, he's the "authority" on bridge jumping, etc. And if P. J. Proudhon happens to be the pioneer teacher of a philosophy he termed "Anarchy," he is certainly the authority on that subject until his arguments are refuted; and any man who calls himself an Anarchist without either accepting or refuting Proudhon is simply sowing confusion.

Still another proof of Mr. Van Ornum's lack of reasoning capacity and understanding of Anarchy is his assertion that Proudhon was "too contradictory." I challenge Mr. Van Ornum to produce ONE contradictory assertion in Proudhon's entire philosophy! Proudhon possessed a marvelous intellect—one analytical enough to see that human society was one mass of contradictions. He never INVENTED any paradoxes, but he DISCOVERED innumerable, many of which Mr. Van Ornum's mind is totally incapable of comprehending. If Mr. Van Ornum would read carefully the "Economical Contradictions" he would save himself from the ridiculous contradictions he is constantly making. As it is pertinent, and also to encourage Mr. Van Ornum to do a little thinking, let me point a few of his "economical contradictions."

1. Mr. Van Ornum asks us "Why government at all?" and then proceeds to argue that we cannot get along without government! Of course, he doesn't mean Mark Hanna's government; he simply means that the individual is a cog in a gigantic wheel (society); that he cannot control the product of his own labor (without which he is a most pitiable slave), yet, according to Mr. Van Ornum, he is free!

2. Mr. Van Ornum insists that his is the "only genuine" brand of libertarian doctrine; yet he has never written an article to my knowledge in which he has

not told his readers that individual freedom was impossible!

3. He has often told us that he has no use for the idle class—vulgarly known as the parasites; yet he tells Mr. Chase that it is the duty of society to stand between the individual and want. Beautiful sentiment! But what a bait for the cunning! As, in a free world, all wealth will be in the hands of laborers, it cannot be the LABORER whom we are to take care of, for he is the ONLY man who can own wealth. Who is this individual? As no pleasure is sweeter than to render aid to the helpless, it cannot be that we need to be told that it is our duty to be benevolent! Does Mr. Van Ornum mean that if I should take a trip to Chicago, get drunk and "blow in" my money, etc., that he would consider it his duty to see that I got my railroad fare back to Boston? Or that the individual is to be saved from the consequences of his own wickedness and folly? Is Mr. Van Ornum going to abolish parasitism by preaching the nonsensical doctrine of duty—the only doctrine which furnishes support to the idle cunning.

4. Mr. Van Ornum is constantly telling us that governments exist only to protect private property! This "economical contradiction" ought to give him fame as a humorist. The truth is, PRIVATE PROPERTY WILL NEVER BE SECURE UNTIL GOVERNMENTS ARE ABOLISHED! When the state disappears then the laborer will be left in full possession of his products. Let the reader get the idea clearly that ONLY LABORERS can own private property, and he will see as clearly that the opposite of Mr. Van Ornum's statement is true, namely, that governments exist for the purpose of CONFISCATING private property! There are, however, two forms of wealth which need protection—common property and property in stolen goods. It requires armies and navies to protect the "common wealth" of the nations; it requires practically the same to protect the rich in possession of the millions they have stolen from the working people. But private property needs no protector, for when all men are laborers all men will be wealth owners; their mutual interests will preclude any necessity for protection!

5. Mr. Van Ornum wants to abolish private property—something that NEVER EXISTED; and desires to establish common property—something that ALWAYS existed! The human family has lived in a state of Communism for surely several hundred thousand years; in fact, in order to survive, Communism is the ONLY POSSIBLE form of society among insects, animals and primitive men. We have passed through negative Communism, in which "the weak exploited the strong" by being fed and protected by the latter. We are now passing through positive Communism, in which "the strong exploit the weak," by compelling tribute. John D. Rockefeller does not sleep in the same bed nor eat off the same table with Mr. Van Ornum, yet he shares wealth IN COMMON with the latter just as truly as he would under Mr. Van Ornum's system of Anarchism! Yet the Chicago philosopher says "there must be no divided interests," not seeing his ridiculous paradox.

Space alone forbids me continuing almost indefinitely Mr. Van Ornum's paradoxes and contradictions! Yet he

calmly tells us Proudhon was "too contradictory." The reader is surely entitled to a laugh at Van Ornum's expense.

"Let the truth be known." Let me tell the reader why it is that Mr. Van Ornum and others of his school of thought are so anxious to repudiate "Tuckerism." It is a rare thing to find an individual who is not a sentimental fanatic on some subject, but who takes reason for his guide at all times, and follows wherever it leads. Tucker is such a character. Mr. Van Ornum will follow reason until it brings him in contact with his ideals; then reason is thrown overboard and he sticks to the ideals. Instead of trying to solve the problems confronting us in present society Mr. Van Ornum builds in his mind an ideal society where men are brothers and wealth is produced in such abundance that none shall want. Beautiful, I'll admit. But Andrew Carnegie and J. D. Rockefeller are constantly telling their Sunday-school scholars that that is THEIR ideal also, for in brotherhoods there are always big brothers and little brothers. And God, the father, places all the wealth of the world in the hands of the big brothers (Carnegie, Rockefeller, et al.) to take care of the little brothers (working people). Thus a beautiful ideal is turned into a bunco game. Taking reason always as their guide, the "Tuckerites" are not the kind of foxes to be caught with such chaff. They find this world to be a sad disappointment for dreamers, and are willing to take the facts of the universe as they find them and make the best of it. Now, we come to the point. After giving a precise definition to the word "government," Tucker, as well as all other Anarchists, would use force DEFENSIVELY against all kinds of governments and all kinds of governors; while Mr. Van Ornum would oppose only political governments. "Any individual who inflicts his will upon another by the use of aggressive force is a governor." The worst kind of a governor, then, is not a king, but a murderer. Mr. Van Ornum would gladly hang a king to suppress collective government, but is horrified when Tucker says Anarchists may consistently hang murderers to suppress INDIVIDUAL government. So it will be seen that Mr. Van Ornum would use force only against POLITICAL, but not against the INDIVIDUAL governments of rape fiends and murderers. Is it necessary for me to ask the reader which is the logical position for an Anarchist to take? I think not.

My references to Tucker in DISCONTENT have been prompted purely by a sense of fair play and love of the truth. Although holding him in high esteem for what he has taught me, as a leader and follower I am no more of a "Tuckerite" than Tucker is a "Smithite." But I love fair play. So let the truth be known.

I owe the reader an apology for stating that Proudhon "coined" the word "Anarchy." That was a "slip of the pen." I should have said he was the first to adopt the word to express the idea of social peace and harmony—the antithesis of its popular meaning, which was "confusion and chaos." Even so great a champion of liberty as Edmund Burke, in the British parliament over a century ago, referred to the army estimates as a "digest of Anarchy," using the word in its popular sense. Proudhon, seeing the

paradoxical nature of human society, said to himself: "This very word means ORDER, not chaos." He was, therefore, the first to use it in that sense.

WM. A. SMITH.

#### INCOHERENT THIS TIME, MR. SMITH.

I never "defied" Mr. Smith "to show how a railroad could be built without violating the principle of equal freedom." I wanted to know how it could be built under anarchic conditions, and in his answer Mr. Smith plainly stated that either there would be no obstructors or if there were they would be forcibly dealt with if necessary. The latter procedure would be a virtual exercise of the right of eminent domain, a right not recognized by Anarchists. Therefore, I characterized Mr. Smith's answer as "sound but inconsistent," and, whatever be his opinion about my "honesty," I am still of the same mind. The location, construction and maintenance of highways are matters that concern the community as such and should be decided by the community as such. Even Mr. Smith has to do a lot of wriggling and twisting when he undertakes to buck against common sense.

Again, the object of the single tax is to establish equal freedom with regard to the use of the earth, without which equality of freedom in any other regard is an impossibility. A great many Single Taxers base the community's claim to the value of the land upon the fact that it is a value created by the community. I do not. For years I have been doing all that I could to make Single Taxers see that this is an argument that proves altogether too much, all values, as Mr. Smith says, being the creation of the community. But the employment of a fallacious argument does not necessarily imply the unsoundness of the proposition in support of which it is advanced. I want economic rent used for public expenses because there is no other fair and honest way to meet those expenses—no other way consistent with the principle of equal freedom. I am very glad that I can't see that such a disposal of rent is an aggression. As to what Herbert Spencer may see, since he turned coward in his old age and lied about what he said in his youth, what he sees or doesn't see is a matter of no interest to me whatever.

In conclusion, Mr. Smith, permit me to inform you that if you really understood the single tax proposition you wouldn't make such ridiculous criticisms in commenting upon the letters of Mr. Martin and myself. You are one of those who got way beyond "Progress and Poverty" before ever you half mastered its contents. You are not sufficiently acquainted with that or with any other of Mr. George's works to be able to judge whether he was a thinker or not. Your barrels of fish argument, however, is calculated to leave no doubt in the mind of the average reader that your mental apparatus isn't always in working order. But I'll leave that part of your funeral in Mr. Martin's charge.

H. J. CHASE.

The greatest disgrace of the age is the murdering by McKinley of innocent foreigners on their own soil with rapid-fire guns, mowing them down for practice and then brutally killing the wounded. —Ex.



## TO MY EMPLOYER.

Having learned a good trade, having studied day and night in order to perfect myself in same, having proved my ability by being at the head of my profession, I find myself, after years and a long run of misfortune, in your employ as a laborer. With all my references as to character and ability—a man who has succeeded in producing a given work where others failed—with my skill I could produce something which would give to society at least as much as I receive from same, provided I had the tools at my disposition. As it is, I must hire myself out to those who own, who have possession of the tools, who hold the earth—the capitalist.

My entering your establishment was caused by the suffering of those depending on me. The fact that you have retained me for years is proof that my work is satisfactory to you, while the pay to me is not. Nor is it to the 1499 other "hands" that are in your employ. Their striking ought to have proven their discontent to you.

Of course they are ignorant that are robbed. If their brains were not so densely fogged then they could see the shore of liberty; at present they only see the danger lights placed by cunning and designing money bugs to make the workingmen believe they are going in a dangerous direction. These lights are the places of individual authority such as "gang boss," "forman," "spotter," "superintendent" and "manager," the places which some of the low minded workingmen do covet, while the unbiased laborers say with Burns:

If I'm designed yon lordling's slave,  
By nature's law designed,  
Why was an independent will  
E're planted in my mind?

Yes; by what right do you make us come to work at the call of a bell? By what right do you rob us legally and illegally? Remember, at least 85 per cent of your slaves are intelligent enough to know their position and do not and would not desire to give their bread money to buy a silver cup for one who murdered thousands of men to enlarge the boundaries of such a rotten, cowardly, mean and debased system as capitalism is today. Properly, you knew this. How, then, did you dare to donate \$150 for a "loving cup" in their name and have all their names printed in one of our—no! in one of YOUR—Sunday papers, thereby making the friends of the 1,500 men in your employ believe that we reward a professional murderer by acclamation and 10-cent pieces. I don't believe there is one man in your employ who would willingly give 10 cents for such an unworthy object.

But if there are any who desire to contribute for such a purpose on a \$7.50 a week salary after having 40 cents for a sick and death benefit society taken out, and other deductions made, they are at liberty to do so.

Finally, it would be interesting to know what your idea was in acting thus. As an advertisement it was hardly a success. If it was suggested by the helots of the press as a bait to draw the dimes from the pockets of hungry proletarians then it was a crime against the poor toiler. I, for one, must most emphatically and energetically protest against the using of our names for such a purpose.

New York City.

## THEOLOGICAL JUSTICE.

(Continued from page 1.)

St. Peter: Hast thou kept the law?  
Girl (trembling): Not ALL, great judge; I am guilty. I have sinned deeply before God and man, for which I humbly beg thy clemency.

St. Peter: Hast thou broken the seventh commandment?

Girl (deeply agitated): Yes, holy judge, and I have paid the marital penalty. I have a child. I was very young, only 16, when I fell deeply in love, was wronged, betrayed and deserted by my lover and left to the mercy of the cold world, which proved too severe a strain upon my delicate constitution and tired nature succumbed to the inevitable, ushering me into thy holy presence with all my earthly imperfections. Heavenly judge, thou who hast the power to seal and unseal the doom of erring mortals, forgive, forgive!

Judge: Here Gabriel, pick out one of those latest style crowns, from lot No. 1, for this woman, and take her in and introduce her to the angels.

HATTIE F. HADLEY.

Napavine, Wash.

A "judge" named Sawyer, of Ann Arbor, Mich., who is reported as a "jurist of prominence"—that is to impress the gullible that he is somebody—is out in a signed article in the press advocating that the Philippines be made a penal colony, like Siberia, to send felons made by the mis-called civilization that obtains here. If the real felons could be sent there it might result in their reformation after a few generations, as did New Zealand for the British. But who is to decide who are the criminals? If Judge Sawyer, then as well leave it to a king. All people whom the king believes inimicable to his plots are always felons and his judges promptly send them up. If the Algiers, Brices, Rockefeller, Astors, Sawyers, Otis and others of their class could be sent to the Philippines, it would purify the atmosphere here very much, and might in time make this country a decent place to live in. But, perhaps, it would be better to have them here, for it is the work of such men in concentrating and combining and corrupting that is opening the eyes of the people. The "eminent jurist"—probably cost him an X—says that "criminals are made worse when kept in restraint." If this be true, it follows logically that restraint made them criminals. And that is just the case. Restraint will make a "criminal" of any man. Deny a man food legally and he will get it illegally, even if he commit murder for it. Make it impossible for a man to satisfy natural needs and he will break over any regulations that you may put around him. That is the cause of crime. The man who commits robbery when hungry is no more a criminal than the hawk that swoops down on your barnyard to satisfy its hunger. When laws contravene natural right they create legal criminal, but the law is wrong. Great is the "prominent jurist" Sawyer.—Appeal to Reason.

There are two kinds of trusts—monopolistic and cooperative; the latter legitimate, the former vicious. The cooperative trust is a benefit to all, but the monopolistic trust is simply legalized robbery.—Independent.

## ASSOCIATION NOTES.

Mrs. L. Tyler and daughter are visiting Mrs. Stocker.

M. E. Morse, of San Francisco, who was with us last year for a while, spent a few days here last week.

F. H. Worden has taken a lot and has gone to work clearing it. He came clear across from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Bro. Joseph Adams, of Equality, spent two days with us last week and spoke one evening on "How to Make Life a Luxury."

Sunday, July 30, most of our people started with their lunch baskets to visit their friends, the Minters, six miles up the coast. It was an ideal day for a picnic and we think they all enjoyed themselves.

This association is simply a land-holding institution, and can take no part in the starting of an industry. All industries are inaugurated by the members interested and those willing to help them. Just now we have about 65 people here (men, women and children). Streets are not opened yet and we have no sidewalks. Those thinking of coming here must expect to work, as it is not an easy job to clear this land and get it ready for cultivation. The only industry established at present is logging, and that is very hard work. We are not living communistic as a body; only two families are living that way, but there is nothing in our articles of incorporation and agreement to prohibit any number of persons from living in that manner if AGREEABLE.

## HOW TO GET HERE.

Parties intending to visit us will come to Tacoma and take the steamer TY-PHOON for Joes Bay. The steamer leaves Commercial dock every day, except Tuesday and Sunday, at 2.30 p. m. Leaves Sunday at 8 a. m. Be sure to ask the captain to let you off at JOES BAY.

The suppression of free speech goes bravely on, having reached Alaska, a miners' meeting of a thousand men at Cape Nome and Anvil City having been dispersed by a squad of soldiers, under command of United States Commissioner Shepherd, on the ground that they were not property owners! The meeting was held to denounce the wholesale and illegal gobbling of claims through Laplanders and missionaries, even the reindeer, which the government imported at great public expense, and which the Laps were hired to care for, having been used to haul the stakes to mark the claims. The evident purpose in Alaska, as in the Philippines, is to grab natural resources for the benefit of syndicates.—S. F. Star.

The new rules of the navy department require each officer on shipboard to have eight distinct uniforms, ornamented with gold laces in varying quantities. Meantime the ordinary man will worry along with one suit to work in and another for Sundays—if he is fortunate enough to acquire the latter. And he will continue, as heretofore, to pay taxes for the purchase of the eight distinct uniforms, ornamented with gold braid.—Justice.

## RECEIPTS.

Sipple 40c, Hadley 25c, Knight 10c.

## DISCONTENT IS HANDLED BY:

Boston—Columbia Stationery Store  
935 Washington st.  
Boston—C. A. Sibley, 642 Washington street.

## AGENTS FOR DISCONTENT.

San Francisco—L. Nylen, 17 Congo st.  
Honolulu—A. Klemencic, Alakea st.

**A SPIRIT PHYSICIAN**—Teaches how to avoid hereditary disease and gives instruction in ways tending to insure the happiness of the family. Price 50 cents. For sale by Lois Waisbrooker, Santa Ana, Calif.

**MY CENTURY PLANT**—By Lois Waisbrooker—Social because so much in advance of the time that only thinkers will appreciate. Written under the influence of an adept of old Atlantis. Shows the law of regeneration, of materialization, the root of church power, and how to free the earth of sex disease. A remarkable book. Price \$1. For sale by Lois Waisbrooker, Santa Ana, Calif.

**FREEDOM**, a monthly journal of Anarchist Communism. Address, 7 Lamb's Conduit St., London, W. C., England. Price 40 cents per year, postpaid.

**FREE SOCIETY**, an advocate of Anarchist Communism. 50 cents a year. 43 Sheridan street, San Francisco, Calif.

**THE EAGLE AND THE SERPENT** proclaims the gospel of "Salvation by Selfishness." For sample copy (3c.) write A. Mueller, 108 Clark street, Chicago, Ill.

**THE ALTRUIST** is a monthly paper, partly in phonetic spelling, and devoted to equal rights, mutual assistance, united labor, and common property. It is issued by the Altruist Community, of St. Louis, whose members hold all their property in common, live and work together in a permanent home for their mutual enjoyment, assistance and support, and both men and women have equal rights and decide on all its business affairs by their majority vote. It now has 3,920 acres of land in Southeast Missouri on which it offers a home and employment for life to all acceptable persons who may wish to join it. 25c a year; specimen copy free. A. Longley, editor, 2819 Olive street, St. Louis, Mo.

## Articles of Incorporation and Agreement of the Mutual Home Association.

Be it remembered, that on this 17th day of January, 1898, we, the undersigned, have associated ourselves together for the purpose of forming a corporation under the laws of the State of Washington.

That the name of the corporation shall be The Mutual Home Association.

The purpose of the association is to assist its members in obtaining and building homes for themselves and to aid in establishing better social and moral conditions.

The location of this corporation shall be at Home City, located on Joes Bay, Pierce County, State of Washington; and this association may establish in other places in this state branches of the same where two or more persons may wish to locate.

Any person may become a member of this association by paying into the treasury a sum equal to the cost of the land he or she may select and one dollar for a certificate and subscribing to this agreement.

The affairs of this association shall be conducted by a board of trustees, elected as may be provided by the by laws.

A certificate of membership shall entitle the legal holder to the use and occupancy of not less than one acre of land nor more than two (less all public streets) upon payment annually into the treasury of the association a sum equal to the taxes assessed against the tract of land he or she may hold.

All money received from memberships shall be used only for the purpose of purchasing land. The real estate of this association shall never be sold, mortgaged or disposed of. A unanimous vote of all members of this association shall be required to change these articles of incorporation.

No officer, or other person, shall ever be empowered to contract any debt in the name of this association.

All certificates of membership shall be for life.

Upon the death of any member a certificate of membership shall be issued covering the land described in certificate of membership of deceased:

First: To person named in will or bequest.

Second: Wife or husband.

Third: Children of deceased; if there is more than one child they must decide for themselves.

All improvements upon land covered by certificate of membership shall be personal property, and the association as such has no claim thereto.

Any member has the right of choice of any land not already chosen or set aside for a special purpose.

## CERTIFICATE OF MEMBERSHIP.

This is to certify that has subscribed to the articles of incorporation and agreement and paid into the treasury of The Mutual Home Association the sum of . . . dollars, which entitles . . . to the use and occupancy for life of lot . . . block . . . as platted by the association, upon complying with the articles of agreement.